DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 386 HE 021 077

AUTHOR	Spitzberg, Irving J., Jr.
TITLE	Introduction to Campus Programs on Leadership. Luce Leadership Series.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges, Washington, DC. Council for Liberal Learning.
SPONS AGENCY	Henry Luce Foundation, New York, N. Y.
PUB DATE	Sep 86
NOTE	32p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College Curriculum; *College Programs; Higher Education; Humanities; *Leadership Training; *Liberal Arts; Management Development; *Social Sciences; *Student Development; *Student Leadership
IDENTIFIERS	College of Wooster OH; Duke University NC; Military Academy (West Point) NY; Mount Saint Marys College CA; Public Leadership Education Network; University of Tampa FL

ABSTRACT

Leadership development programs on U.S. campuses are discussed. Three categories of campus-based leadership development programs have been identified: the co-curricular program arising out of a student development office or direct student initiative; the academic course that draws mainly on social psychological and management studies literatures; and the liberal arts academic courses that places the study of leadership in the context of both the humanities and the social sciences. Suggestions for leadership programs are offered. Six programs are described in detail that emphasize different categories of programs or that combine the types in different ways. These programs are: the Expanded Curriculum for Excellence in Leadership (EXCEL) at the University of Tampa (Florida); the leadership program at Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles (California); an academic and co-curricular leadership program at West Point (New York); the study of leadership as liberal arts at the College of Wooster (Ohio); a liberal arts leadership program at Duke University (North Carolina); and the Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN), a consortium of 10 women's colleges that is administered by Goucher College (Maryland). Contacts for these six programs and for four additional ones are specified. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290386

Luce Leadership Series

Campus Programs on Leadership

Irving Spitzberg

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 021 077

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction to Campus Programs on Leadership

By Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr.
Executive Director
Council for Liberal Learning
Association of American Colleges

Supported by a Grant from the Henry Luce Foundation

September 1986

During the last few years — indeed, in the last few months — there has been a veritable explosion of interest on campuses across the country in developing teaching and cocurricular programs to help students better understand the nature of leadership and to develop leadership skills themselves.[1] This interest is found as well in the larger community. Approximately 250 cities and towns have created local leadership development programs, often modelled on Leadership Atlanta, where young business and professional persons are exposed to a range of civic problems and encouraged to involve themselves in solving them as activists in the community.[2]

All of this activity borders on a social movement somewhat reminiscent of the Good Government movement in the United States in the 1940s and 1950s. At that time there was a move to professionalize the management of cities and to create a science and profession of public administration through research and teaching on campus. That movement reflected deep popular dissatisfaction with the nature of local government and was a direct heir of the Progressive movement with its faith in science and professionalism. Today the interest in leadership arises from a similar dissatisfaction — with the standards of leadership at all levels of society and in a range of institutional settings — but does not have great expectations for scientific or professional solutions. Indeed, those interested in leadership to date have eschewed traditional sources of scholarship. This has been much more a movement of civic participation both on campus and off. Now, however, there is growing concern about the quality of programs dealing with leadership and a sense that this spontaneous movement needs some enrichment.

Recognizing the breadth of interest in improving leadership, the Council for Liberal Learning of the Association of American Colleges and the Alliance for Leadership Development are cooperating, with the support of the Luce Foundation, in a project to encourage more and better research and teaching about leadership on campuses and in the community. The Leadership Project of the Association

[1] Colonel Robert Gregory of the Air Force Academy, on leave at the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina, has surveyed all campus presidents and reported at the AAHE Meeting in March 1986 and at the Center for Creative Leadership in July 1986 that more than 600 campuses indicate some sort of leadership activity.

[2] See report in article by Carl Moore in *Leadership*, Volume 1, No.1, May, 1986.

of American Colleges is focusing on the campus; the Alliance for Leadership Development is targeting the community.

On behalf of the Leadership Project, I have visited a number of campuses in the last few months to observe leadership programs. We also have sponsored panels at national meetings on teaching about leadership and cocurricular[3] leadership development activities. We convened the first National Conference on the Study and Practice of Leadership in Washington this summer, where over 100 scholars, teachers, and administrators meet to inaugurate our new network and discuss the quality of teaching about leadership. This report draws both on my personal observations and the written and oral comments of leaders of leadership programs at national meetings. My goal is to outline examples of the range of diverse leadership programs and then to suggest lessons we might learn from them. I will also offer some tips about starting new campus programs on leadership.

4 This is a "journalistic report," not a social scientific study or a structured evaluation of the programs reported. Although I believe that most of the programs are quite meritorious, my exposure to them was too brief for a comprehensive judgment. Some have been in existence for years; others are quite new. Later historians will have to judge both program quality and impact. My pictures will be snapshots rather than movies; my sample will be informed but serendipitous. I do come to some judgments, not about particular programs but about features of programs. Our evidence is limited, but this essay will assemble more and more interesting pieces of the leadership program jigsaw puzzle than we have had in one place to date, so it seems important to extract tentative lessons even as we test ideas.

I thank the Henry Luce Foundation for its support of my efforts. Throughout this essay I indicate a number of sources of information, advice and assistance who deserve praise and appreciation. In addition, I must especially thank Suzanne Nelson of the University of Tampa, Mary Jane Hickey of the Luce Foundation, Frank Pace of the National Executive Service Committee, John Gardner of Independent Sector, and Fontaine Belford, Kim Schlenker, and Sherry Levy-Reiner of AAC for their comments and help. Most insights are those of my colleagues and sources; the mistakes and lacunae are mine.

Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr.
Council for Liberal Learning
Association of American Colleges

[3] Cocurricular in the current campus jargon means "noncredit."

Introduction

Among campus-based leadership programs, we find three categories: 1) the cocurricular leadership development program arising out of a student development office or direct student initiative; 2) the academic course(s) that draws mainly on social psychological and management studies literatures; 3) the liberal arts academic course that places the study of leadership in the context of both the humanities and the social sciences. All campus programs, in reality, include elements of all three approaches but emphasize one or the other.

Of the six programs I will describe in some depth, each emphasizes different categories or combines them in different ways. I have visited four of the campuses — Mount St. Mary's College in Los Angeles, the University of Tampa, the College of Wooster, and West Point. In addition, I have talked at length, read course materials, and had formal reports from two other programs: at Duke University and the Political Leadership Education Network. I also will refer to hearsay about other relevant programs. These six programs certainly exemplify the diversity of approaches one may find around the country and highlight the opportunities and the problems for those interested in starting leadership activities.

5

Developing Leaders: Cocurricular Initiatives

Travelling to various campuses, I have been struck by the initiatives taken and the imagination shown by deans of students. In touch with the students on informal as well as formal terms, they have sensed student interest in learning more about the skills of leadership. Two have overseen the development of two of the most creative leadership development programs on American campuses: those at the University of Tampa and Mount St. Mary's College.

The University of Tampa's EXCEL

I first visited the University of Tampa in early 1985 and observed the EXCEL (Expanded Curriculum for Excellence in Leadership) program, which had been initiated by then Dean of Students — now

Associate Provost — Dr. Suzanne Nelson, a former professor of English literature. The program had been in existence for two years and had an introductory as well as advanced cocurricular set of activities.

Each participating student was selected on the basis of an application and review process.[4] Most striking about the students I met was their diversity of majors. There were a number of biologists, premeds, and other "scientists." All attended twelve weekly seminars that focused on particular leadership skill activities. I attended a workshop on value conflict, which was competently but not inspiringly led by a campus personnel officer. I understand that these seminars were also led, from time to time, by faculty. In the second year the seminar meets all year and involves sessions led by community leaders. All of the students engaged in some form of community service.

Each student has an upper-level student mentor and meets each term with the program coordinator. In 1985, the EXCEL program started a cooperative program for advanced students with a local chapter of the National Executive Service Corps to establish a series of mentorships with distinguished retired leaders in the Tampa community. The reports on these mentorships all have been enthusiastic. Both the mentors and mentees have found the relationship provides an unusual opportunity for them to get to know each other informally, which also allows for special insights into the personal realities of leadership. Students also interview members of the university administration.

The third level of EXCEL, Applied EXCEL, has the experienced students in their junior year plan and implement a leadership program with high schools. They host a conference on leadership for high school students and act as the upper-level peer advisors. In September a new EXCEL IV level will include seniors advising other students who may apply for and perhaps receive grants from the university to participate in cocurricular activities. These seniors also will conduct leadership development sessions for the grantees and will themselves become leadership developers as well as leaders.

The faculty at the University of Tampa has maintained some distance from the EXCEL program. In the past there had been a move

[4] The factual material in this section is drawn both from my own observation and from a report given by Dr. Nelson at the March AAHE Meeting and documented in a subsequent written essay.

to seek academic credit for participation in the program. The faculty opposed the move because of the skills development character of the enterprise. The existence of EXCEL, however, has encouraged a number of faculty to think about credit-bearing courses. As part of the reform of the undergraduate curriculum at Tampa, faculty are now designing a core curriculum course to explore leadership from a number of disciplinary perspectives.

Faculty and student respect for Dr. Nelson, and publicity provided by the university president for EXCEL were important complements to Dr. Nelson's initiative in recruiting enthusiastic young student development staff. The continuing involvement of experienced students in the program in a student mentor role also enriches the experience of students entering the program and maintains the identity of the student constituency throughout the undergraduate experience.

EXCEL's accomplishments are impressive, both in the level of student excitement and in the diversity of activity supported on a financial shoestring. Most of the staff time was devoted in addition to other responsibilities. But it has survived and even prospered because of administrative imagination and student enthusiasm.

Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles

Mount St. Mary's leadership program was initiated by the president, but it has grown and prospered because of the energy and imagination of another student affairs dean, Cheryl Mabey, a lawyer and former community college political science instructor, who herself is a graduate of "The Mount," as they call the college. Cheryl Mabey was recently appointed a Kellogg Leadership Fellow.

Mount St. Mary's is a women's college. The student body at the Mount is unusually diverse: over 60 percent of the students are *not* white Anglo-Saxons. I met with five students: one was Black, one was Hispanic, one was Polish, one was Chinese, and one was WASP. In the program, the students engage in some form of student activity leadership and/or community service. They also take a one-credit skills seminar each term that exposes them to a range of social psychological theories of leadership and focuses on the development of specific skills such as time management, parliamentary procedure, and mediation.

The young women were quite enthusiastic about what they got out of the leadership program. One young woman talked about her role as secretary of the student government and said she would not have run for office had she not been encouraged to do so by the leadership program. She had help from the program in learning how to take and keep minutes. A young Chinese woman said that one of her teachers persuaded her to participate in the leadership program, because, although her grades were very high, she did not participate actively in classroom discussion, and the teacher thought the leadership program would put her more at ease in a range of settings. Thanks to the leadership program, she engaged in a variety of new activities.

I had an opportunity to chat at some length with members of the faculty. A member of the biology department, active in pre-med advising, urged her students to take the cocurricular courses and credit seminars, and said that she saw important changes in the women who participated. This professor also said that there was some skepticism among the faculty — by implication she herself shared it — about the investment of resources in the leadership program, which they viewed as expensive. But she said that she had been persuaded that, on balance, it was valuable. Cheryl Mabey pointed out that though relatively little money was actually invested in the program, the faculty assumed otherwise because of its visibility and activities.

Faculty members were becoming quite interested in developing a full and coordinated academic program to complement the primarily cocurricular activities and the one-credit seminars. Dean Mabey coteaches a one-semester course with a member of the psychology department. A philosophy professor developed courses on women's studies and the philosophy of feminism that explicitly dealt with leadership issues. A member of the political science department regularly connects his courses with leadership program activities. At this writing the Mount is planning a leadership minor to be coordinated with other majors.

One of the most impressive features of the Mount's program is the degree of alumnae activity through "The Network." These alumnae who lead the Network are strikingly articulate and quite impressive; they included a young woman who had a middle-management position, another who was a consultant, a third who was doing graduate work in American studies, and a young Hispanic woman who was working as a district officer for a congressman. All of these alumnae of the early days of the program were quite poised. They could connect explicitly their learning experiences in the leadership program to their current work and community roles. All of these

women were clearly quite successful in their careers and most were on fast tracks, given their relative youth and inexperience.

Most of the women in the Network had not been exposed to an extensive academic program in the leadership activities; instead, in an institution where women did not come with expectations of leadership, the program's most important contribution was motivational. They all agreed that the leadership program gave them new aspirations for leadership as well as the poise and the confidence to try to become leaders. I was quite impressed with the enthusiasm and commitment of these alumnae to the current program and to organizing the Network. They continue to identify with the leadership program as something important in their lives.

The Mount has had in place some version of the leadership program for nine years. Its value to the students, in their own eyes, is quite clear both from the current and the alumnae participants. But it has only been recently that there has been a move on the part of the faculty to engage more clearly in teaching about leadership and integrating understanding about leadership into the liberal arts curriculum. This leadership program has been viewed as very much a student affairs activity, despite the efforts of Dean Mabey to involve faculty and to guarantee significant academic integrity for the one-credit seminar.

In responding to these impressions, Dean Mabey wrote:

> The shift in motivation has not come through the student affairs side or cocurricular involvement, but in the multidisciplinary content of particularly "Leadership I." In fact, the cocurricular involvement is secondary to the academic content of freshmen seminars. I substantiate this claim by the research in a . . . study of Mount freshmen. This master's thesis in psychology found that within six months students taking Leadership I had changed their prescriptions of how groups were effectively led, were more sophisticated in their use of motivation, and had higher aspirations than the control group of freshmen not enrolled in Leadership I . . . Their student activism comes afterwards in point of fact.
>
> . . . On the whole, if the institution were asked, "Where does the program reside?" the answer would be student affairs. If the question were "How does it function?" it would be a hybrid. That is what I wanted to create — an institutional approach not easily categorized because I believe it is the dichotomy between academic function and

> student affairs function that inhibits development of leadership within students. I have asked repeatedly, "Where are the opportunities for learning about leadership in the college?" The answer is, I think, in the classroom, outside in activism/professional opportunities, through institutional role models, institutional policies, etc.

Dean Mabey's eloquence demonstrates how she has put her mark on the Mount's leadership program and maintained its quality; however, when contrasted to other programs around the country, as the reader will see in due course, the Mount's leadership program is indeed a hybrid, but one with more of a student skills development emphasis than a traditional academic emphasis. To make this point is only to observe, not criticize. And the evolution of the program into an academic minor will be accompanied by an important organizational change: Cheryl Mabey will return to a real half-time faculty role where she can teach and write in her new position as director of the Women's Leadership Center at the Mount. This change will contribute to the evolution of the program and to us all if it gives her time to share her experiences in critical perspective with those of us interested in leadership development.

10

Other Mainly Cocurricular Programs

Although the University of Tampa and Mount St. Mary's leadership programs have a distinctive and unusually extensive range among the primarily cocurricular programs that have come to my attention, others are of interest to those concerned about leadership development activity. For example, Tom Shandley has established an extensive mentorship program at the University of Minnesota-St. Paul campus. Evaluations of the program have found that graduates of the program were quite pleased with it. Howard University has had, for many years, an extensive program of leadership training for undergraduates active in student affairs. Many other cocurricular programs are emerging around the country.

Leadership Through Applied Social Sciences

The modern discipline with the longest history of interest in the study of leadership is social psychology. Indeed, most courses in social psychology have included some work on leadership since the 1940s. The field of organizational behavior that has emerged in business schools has drawn on social psychology in its methods and interests as applied to corporate settings in particular so that schools of management have taken the social psychology tradition and put it into an applied context. This applied social sciences approach is one of the most ubiquitous in the country. It finds a unique environment for testing in the longstanding leadership program at West Point.

West Point: Applied Behavioral Sciences in a Culture of Leadership Expectations

One of the most extensive academic and cocurricular leadership programs in the country is at West Point. The first fact about leadership development one must recognize at West Point is that its whole culture is imbued with the expectation of leadership, and the cocurricular program is directed toward the experience of leadership. In addition, West Point has had, for many years, a Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, led by Colonel Howard Prince and staffed by an outstanding cadre of about 25 young officers who have graduate degrees in psychology, sociology, or management and who come back for three years to teach traditional psychology courses and a special course and sequence on leadership. All of these young faculty go back to the Army in fast-track leadership positions themselves, intending to have stars on their shoulders as soon as possible. Colonel Prince and his colleague Lt. Colonel Barney Forsythe are the tenured members of the faculty who are directly responsible for the leadership program. Five other permanent military faculty provide long-term direction for other academic programs within the department.

In order to learn more about this crucible for leadership, I visited West Point. Joining me on this visitation was Suzanne Nelson from Tampa, who had worked with the ROTC there. She contributed a valuable perspective and was able to initiate an especially useful dialogue with female cadets.

Authority at West Point is divided between the academic dean,

who is a tenured professor holding the rank of general, and the commandant, who is also a general and is in charge of all military activities, the cadet corps itself, and all student development. Both the commandant and the dean report to the superintendent of the academy, who is a senior general. Since the dean is a tenured academic, he stays for the duration of his career once he is appointed, whereas the commandant and most of his staff are on three year assignments. Compared to the academic side, there is relatively little continuity among the commandant's officers. Success in the commandant's jurisdiction is measured more in relation to short-term goals than longer term progress. The dean has control over the cadet schedule from 7:30am to 3:30pm. The commandant has all other time.

We met with a number of students, including both men and women. Some were seniors, including a woman who is deputy commander (number two in the cadet chain of command) of the corps. Some were juniors — "cows" — and two were plebes. All were exceedingly articulate. We asked them about the leadership course. Those who had taken it found it useful during their summer experiences as leaders. One platoon leader said he used it from time to time but not so much as his classmate, Lissa, the corps deputy commander, who found the course materials quite salient as she confronted the complexities of the large organization of the corps as a whole. All of the students clearly had come to West Point because of their and the institution's expectations of leadership. They gave accounts of their experiences at the various levels of development in the non-classroom environment. The experiences of leadership in the corps and during the summer before the required course became the meat of analysis in the course itself. All of these students were exceedingly bright and thoughtful. Lissa's combination of wit, insight, presence, and respect was simply extraordinary.

We had the opportunity to visit a class in the required course on leadership. I visited Captain Mike Hughes' leadership class. My guide to the classroom was a young woman from our earlier discussion, who was a national class gymnast (she and all of her colleagues were amazingly fit, since physical prowess is another important ingredient of the West Point leadership ethos). This was a section of the required course in leadership in organizations for all students. The text was prepared under Howard Prince's guidance and is primarily applied social psychology.

The topic of the class was stress management. The instructor showed a list of casualties in major battles beginning with World

War I, then World War II, the Korean War, Vietnam, and the last Arab-Israeli war. The percentage of stress casualties had grown from less than 10 percent to a percentage almost equal to the other casualties. It became clear that stress was an important battlefield variable. The instructor drew on the text to get the cadets to volunteer analytical frameworks. Then the students, who sat around tables, were given cases to analyze; each table took a case. After about ten minutes of table discussion, the class as a whole discussed the cases. The instructor was exceedingly effective. He had a strong Southern drawl and used humor effectively in questioning the students. Although the subject was quite practical, it was connected to a theoretical perspective. All of the issues were explicated using military examples.

My colleague, Dr. Nelson, attended the class taught by Captain Gayle Watkins, a graduate of Gettysburg College and the Harvard Business School. Dr. Nelson observed that Captain Watkins inspired a spirited discussion and avoided giving "right answers." She constantly found ways to relate behavioral theories and management strategies to situations cadets currently face and might expect to face. For example, she discussed combat fatigue at length. She encouraged the students to think through the moral/ethical issues involved in situations in which a leader is required to send a soldier to perform an impossible task, probably facing certain death. Dr. Nelson observed, "I had the sensation of at least four high-quality hours of teaching/learning being packed into one." Colonel Prince said that Captain Watkins is likely to be a multi-star general because she is so good.

As I indicated earlier, the two tenured members of the faculty oversee the work of the other faculty who are very bright instructors, selected either from among recent West Point graduates or the best officers in the Army to go for their doctorates or other graduate training and return to teach the specific courses. All are in the fast lane for promotion. A tour of duty as a faculty member or a tactical officer is a plum assignment. Working for Colonel Prince is viewed as especially attractive, because he was the youngest chair of a department at West Point. He is viewed as a potential successor to Colonel Lincoln, who used to chair the political science department and who got many of his faculty and students appointed generals. They talked about the "Lincoln Tunnel." They may someday talk about "Prince's Roundtable." Colonel Prince sets the tone for leadership studies at West Point.

Leadership development activity demands close cooperation with

the tactical officer, who is a captain or major assigned to work with a company of cadets during the students' time at the academy. Each "Tac," as they are called, is given a one-year master's program, usually in counseling, which then allows them to combine counseling skills with military training. The Tacs are high-priced and highly skilled student development officers.

We met with Captain Mike Calpo, a Tac who had returned to West Point because he was so affected by his own Tac. This man was the student personnel officer with the greatest accomplishment in another professional field whom I have ever met. These Tacs (and their spouses) are clearly the key to leadership development at West Point. This Tac and his spouse devoted a very long day everyday to the 120 students in his company. Their assignment is to turn a cadet into an officer.

The commandant's side of the program makes a further contribution to leadership development through the commandant's Center for Leadership and Personal Development, which offers skills training to cadets who need or desire further assistance in improving their performance in their leadership roles. The center is directed by Colonel Will Wilson, who has been in charge of counseling for almost six years, which is an unusual tour of duty on the commandant's side. Colonel Wilson has been working closely with Colonel Prince in coordinating the leadership educational program on both sides of the campus.

Dr. Nelson met with a group of female cadets. I intentionally did not join the group until after 45 minutes had elapsed so that my (male) presence would not inhibit candid discussion. By the time I arrived, the discussion was quite animated and in full force. The female cadets clearly felt discriminated against in many ways but they had developed sophisticated strategies for coping. They drew on different sources of support — one drew on religion and her boyfriend, another cadet; a second drew on support from other women. All said that they would not "bitch" to the academy the way they were talking with us, because they did not wish to reinforce their male peer's stereotypical images. One company had not had any females graduate until one of the women in this group had survived. She talked about having to lay down the gauntlet when she did not get cooperation during her summer command. She used a technique used by many women: she did all of the physical tasks better than the males in her unit. Although the female cadets have a somewhat reduced set of physical requirements in comparison to male cadets, they are still able to exceed most male performance in the Army.

This technique of running the men into the ground seems to work well as a command and leadership strategy.

Although the women seem to be accomplishing much, and West Point seems to be adapting to them as well as they are adapting to it, there remains the occasional department perceived by the women to discriminate against them. For example, women who get A's in traditional disciplinary courses get C's and D's in some specialized military courses quite similar in content to the disciplinary sequences. There are no women faculty in the occasional department perceived not to be fair. I must note that this is a report of the female cadets' views, not an assessment of the facts, since we did not visit the department(s) of concern.

I left West Point quite impressed with the quality and maturity of the students. Although they are not so sophisticated as similarly situated students at an Ivy League school, they are clearly first performers. The faculty members, too, are excellent. Although they are not researchers, they are like the best teachers at elite schools.

The academic leadership program itself is too behavioral sciences-oriented. Colonel Prince responded to this observation with this remark:

> It should be noted that West Point's academic course on leadership starts from the premise that each student is preparing for the role of a functional leader in a complex formal organization upon graduation. By choice, then, the basic course taken by all cadets is geared toward the study of those human and organizational phenomena which are of immediate importance. I and my faculty recognize, of course, that leadership can and should be viewed much more broadly and that it is a phenomenon which can be fruitfully approached from many academic disciplinary bases.

When I suggested to Colonel Prince that more traditional politics and history might be included, he said that interdepartmental cooperation and "turf" sharing are difficult to achieve, even at West Point. Colonel Prince intends to seek much more involvement by other disciplines and to broaden his own elective course offerings in leadership.

West Point's academic and cocurricular programs are directed toward the creation of military leaders. Dr. Nelson concluded:

> I perceive the coexistence of these two worlds — the military program and the academic program — to create an

> energetic and perpetual dialectic, with the cadets in the position to arrive at synthesis. The military (tactical) side represents structure, the need for unquestioned responses, an efficient and thus effective military mechanism, the inculcation of discipline, order and regard for hierarchical authority. The academic side, by contrast, presents flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity, the challenge to authority, and an exploration of alternative leadership styles . . . The two together develop in each future military leader the ability to continually transform the ancient and honorable profession of soldiering to meet the ever-more complex needs of society.

I agree with this analysis and believe that the critical contribution West Point can make to those with an interest in education for leadership is the understanding of the importance of connecting extensive academic and cocurricular programs and thinking about them as coequal parts of a whole.

16

The limitations of the applied behavioral sciences approach to an academic program for understanding leadership emerge from a critical review of the West Point book and syllabi. But when one looks at the total West Point curriculum, it is clear that the cadets have an opportunity to consider leadership questions from the range of disciplinary perspectives that any university with a commitment to understanding leadership would offer, and West Point offers this choice in a culture with the highest expectations of quality leadership.

Once again, just as at Mount St. Mary's and at the University of Tampa, we see the critical role of an individual who takes initiatives to energize the study of leadership. Colonel Howard Prince is putting in place his roundtable in a fashion that is likely to guarantee that West Point will maintain its tradition of studying leadership and that we will benefit from an Army officer corps uniquely sensitive to the nature of leadership and far superior in its understanding to most of those who lead civilian organizations. Colonel Prince and his faculty, just as their colleagues, the Tacs, make their most important contribution to leadership education at West Point by the example they set.

Applied Social Sciences in Other Settings

The applied social sciences approach is longstanding in schools of business, as I indicated earlier. A number of business schools make "leadership" part of management courses by explicitly considering the problems of leadership in complex organizations as part of organizational behavior courses. The one-credit seminars at Mount St. Mary's seemed to be primarily applied social sciences. A number of the cocurricular courses take small parts of the larger organizational behavior curricula and teach techniques such as stress and time management and conflict resolution.

In addition to drawing on social psychological and organizational behavior traditions, these applied social sciences courses often use case study pedagogy, with cases carefully selected to test the application of practice consistent with theory. It is important to note, however, that this case study pedagogy generally draws on theories established by surveys or quasi-experimental methods instead of middle-level theories drawn from a carefully constructed case study research method. The case study pedagogy is one of the particular, whereas the social scientific methods used to test leadership theories are far more formalistic. The case study pedagogy and the case study method of studying leadership give a sense of the texture of the particular and may offer more insight than the abstract language of general theoretical statements supported by limited evidence. The pedagogical instinct to use case studies is a good one.

The substance of the West Point course is, in fact, the substance of most consideration of leadership in schools of business. The theory is drawn mainly from the tradition of social psychology as it has manifested itself in organizational behavior. This, then, is the dominant paradigm for the study of leadership in the United States. Its weaknesses are, to some degree, ameliorated by the case method pedagogy. But the applied social sciences approach does not provide sufficient perspective for the meaningful understanding of the complex phenomenon of leadership. The alternative is to place leadership in a broader framework for understanding.

The Study of Leadership as Liberal Arts

One of the central missions of American liberal arts colleges since the early 17th century has been the education of leaders. The elite

institutions have developed cultures of leadership in some ways similar to that of West Point. Princeton "in our nation's service" is a perfect example of the web of expectations that has characterized the elite liberal arts colleges. But even the nonelite small liberal arts colleges have believed that their combination of broad exposure to the arts and sciences, in-depth concentration on one of them through a major, and individual attention within and without the classroom constitute an important form of leadership and liberal education.

More recently, some of these liberal arts institutions have become convinced that a useful complement to this traditional approach would be the explicit study of leadership using the tools and perspectives of a number of the arts and sciences. I shall report on two examples of this latter approach — the College of Wooster, which I recently visited, and Duke, about which I have had oral and written reports.

The College of Wooster

The Luce Foundation funded the College of Wooster to develop a seminar and mentorship for outstanding students to explore leadership from the perspective of the liberal arts. A small and selective liberal arts college in Ohio, Wooster has a diverse student body studying on a typical American campus in a small town in the Midwest. It is exactly the sort of setting where liberal education has been viewed as the appropriate approach to leadership.

The enterprising vice president for academic affairs, Don Harward, and an Alabama populist, who also happens to be a professor of history, Jim Hodges, had the initiative to create the program, which — in addition to an academic seminar and mentoring program — also includes an annual national conference on a leadership theme. This year's first annual conference included a number of nationally prominent scholars talking about leadership: Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Thomas Cronin, Kenneth Clark, and Philip Selznick. The students in the seminar took an active role in planning and implementing the conference.

The seminar itself is composed of about fifteen students from a range of academic backgrounds. All were strong students academically and all had displayed both interest and experience through various leadership activities either on campus or in their home communities. The group included a few Black and foreign students.

The seminar session was chaired by Professor James Hodges, who claims no special expertise in the study of leadership but is a published historian. He was reading many of the works for the first time with his students. His syllabus surveyed many of the classic disciplinary contributions to the study of leadership. He also required that the students keep a running journal relating their readings to a range of personal insights and organizational leadership questions. He chaired the seminar with good humor that sparkled through his Southern accent and an engaging manner of involving the students.

On the day I visited the seminar, the students were reading Yukl's collection of social psychology materials, which presented the scope of the organizational behavior and social psychological approaches to the study of leadership. The seminar's guest presenter was a faculty member from psychology whose own work focused on women's issues and discrimination questions from the perspective of social psychology. Her approach to the readings was enriched by an exposure to many of these questions some years ago during her own graduate work and a healthy skepticism of some of the methods and conclusions. Even though she distanced herself from many of the methods and conclusions, she had to spend much of her time defending the social psychologist's approaches from the criticisms of the students.

Much of the students' criticism was informed by their recent completion of their "acquaintanceships." These limited-term mentorships had given the seminar students an opportunity to spend a week with a nationally prominent leader either in politics, the academy, or the corporate world. One part-time staff member had spent several months arranging these mentorships. The quality of the experiences had varied: a corporate executive had taken a student with him to every meeting and every activity so that he had seen the reality of corporate leadership, while a cabinet member had allowed the student to meet with many of her staff members but had not taken the student into the inner sanctum of departmental life. Regardless of the extent of the acquaintanceship, however, each student had learned much from the relatively brief exposure, because every generalization about leadership that Yukl drew was challenged by one or another acquaintanceship experience.

The students also drew on their broader liberal arts perspectives as well as their own majors to make pointed disciplinary criticisms of the readings under discussion. For example, a very articulate international student drew on his knowledge of econometrics to criticize the interpretation of a graph that only supported an argument based

on correlation because the authors seemed to be making a causal argument. Other students offered similar critiques, drawing on earlier readings from political science and history. Indeed, the consensus of the students seemed to be that the social psychologists had labored long and given birth to trivial generalizations, and that the readings had become quite repetitive in the insights they offered. I found myself in the unusual position of defending social psychology and pointing out the importance of validation by similar insights from different disciplinary perspectives. But the students were quite right in finding many of the books and articles on leadership to be quite repetitious and not very edifying.

The greatest strength of Wooster's approach was the self-conscious use of a range of disciplines and guests with expertise in those disciplines to connect the variety of intellectual traditions to an understanding of this complex phenomenon. The use of the acquaintanceship to provide personal observation of a leader in action allowed the students to build new bridges between their past experiences, those of a community leader, and the theories of leadership, creating an active and exciting sense of discovery.

Duke: Experiencing Leadership in a Liberal Arts Setting

The Duke Leadership Program is part of the Institute of Public Policy Studies, which offers an undergraduate major at Duke as well as extensive graduate programs. The Institute was founded in the 1970s as one of the premier public policy programs in the United States. The Leadership Program is the result of the imagination of Bruce Payne, a political philosopher and long-time Institute faculty member, and the creative philanthropy of Milledge (Mitch) Hart, a Texas entrepreneur and Duke board member, who has endowed the program with a gift of $1 million dollars.

Bruce Payne has put the goal of the Duke program eloquently:

> This country needs leaders who are thoughtful, energetic, and ethically aware, and committed to effective and democratic government. We need them not only in national politics, but in our communities, our professions, our economic and educational and religious institutions . . . The program we propose aims at identifying potential

> leaders early enough in their university careers for us to have an impact on their lives . . . The plan includes live connections with people who are making changes in politics, business, education, philanthropy, religion and elsewhere.[5]

The design of the Duke program begins with an introductory course, "Leadership, Policy, and Change," which combines history, biography, and literature to focus attention on the personal choices and experiences of people who engage in leadership in a number of different settings. Bruce Payne, the director of the program, has put together an exciting syllabus based upon biography and great literature as well as more social scientific materials. Payne recently told an audience that he has taken a solemn oath never again to assign anything other than the very best and most exciting readings to his students; never again will he ask them to read a boring or weak assignment. Each student is expected to undertake research about a particular leader: to explore in detail the personal, public and ethical dilemmas that leaders face so that he or she comes to know one leader well.

In addition, each student in the introductory course must participate in a campus- or community-based service program. John Ott, associate director of the program, makes clear that the role can be either that of leader or follower. What is important is that the student be able to connect the experience with the classroom discussions and readings. John Ott observed:

> One of the fundamental tenets of the Duke program is that, at the very least, leadership requires an active process of action and reflection . . . The leadership projects provide one opportunity for action . . . I do not mean to suggest that every student must lead a project. Often the best leadership projects require students to be followers. But even in those projects, the students must have a relationship with a leader, and be in a position to evaluate the leader's performance.[6]

[5] Quoted from the Prospectus for the program.

[6] Presentation to AAC Annual Meeting in January 1986 and documented in subsequent report.

The range of Duke student leadership projects is impressive. Four leadership students and a graduate student created the Duke-Africa Initiative to take about ten students to work in various relief and development efforts in Kenya for two months. Others created "Connections" to increase campus discussions of apartheid and the University's relationship to it. One student directed Vox Humana, a Duke chorale group. Yet another worked for the Private Industry Council helping to administer a program to provide job training to poor high school students.

Each student meets with a project evaluator at least twice during the semester to examine particular strategic questions about the project and to explore what the student is learning from the experience. The combination of the intellectual, academic, and personal permeates all parts of the Duke program.

In addition to the introductory course, John Ott now has taught, for the first time, a smaller second course for students who have done especially well in the introductory experience. The intention is to have a number of students participate in the program throughout their undergraduate years and then maintain the network after the students graduate, in a manner similar to Mount St. Mary's example.

" We have learned," writes John Ott, "that our program is not so much a 'how to' as it is a 'why to' program."[7] This "why to" orientation is the hallmark of the liberal arts approach to teaching about leadership. The fact that both of our examples of leadership education in a liberal arts context focus on connecting the academic with personal experience finds eloquent justification in this report from a Duke student, Martha Jones, after she conducted her first performance of the Duke Vox Humana:

> The ultimate joy of my project was hearing the tape of the concert, and, upon listening to the second piece Vox Humana did, knowing it was a manifestation of musical grace! It was light in tune, concise, humorous, and "switched on." It wasn't just right, it was music![8]

The fact that a student creatively led music as part of a leadership course built around history and literature testifies to the potential of learning about leadership through a program that casts its net widely.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

Other Approaches in Liberal Arts Settings

There are two other examples of the explicit study of leadership in a liberal arts setting that deserve mention: Thomas Cronin's course at Colorado College and Fred Greenstein's course at Princeton. Professor Cronin has taught for courses on leadership in the political science department at Colorado College. This course, which provided an example for Duke, has focused on the biographies of political leaders and the contribution of history and political science to understanding the nature of leadership. Professor Greenstein's course has concentrated on the nature of leadership in crisis with special attention to Vietnam. He has brought in leaders who were actively involved in the decisions concerning Vietnam and has had his students cross-examine them both on their decisions and on the experience of leadership. Professor Greenstein has written a draft on the subject that offers a theoretical framework for understanding leadership and thus gives students a series of theoretical questions to inform their examination of real leaders and the crisis of Vietnam.

It should be noted that both Professors Cronin and Greenstein are political scientists whose own active research is directed toward understanding leadership. Indeed, Professor Greenstein's study of the Eisenhower presidency is well known, and he is currently planning a book based upon a conference supported by the Luce Foundation that will explore the nature of leadership in the American presidency by the comparative examination of nine American presidents. Cronin is also a student of the American presidency as well as the coauthor of a widely used introductory text on American politics. The Princeton and Colorado teaching programs both flow from the research of two distinguished scholars.

Cooperating For Leadership

Having toured a number of campuses, we should consider one program that serves a number of campuses. A consortium of ten women's colleges has cooperated in the Public Leadership Education Network(PLEN) administered by Goucher College.

PLEN was founded by Sissy Farenthold, then president of Wells College, to provide a variety of programs to motivate and prepare women for public leadership responsibilities. In the beginning each college offered a different programmatic approach. Spelman College

developed courses on black women in politics. Stephens College featured a woman political leader as a politician-in-residence who cotaught a course. Goucher College placed students in internships with women political leaders. And Wells College sponsored a series of public policy conferences with prominent women leaders as speakers. Since 1982, a special seminar has been offered annually in Washington, D.C., to serve students at PLEN colleges.

Marianne Alexander, executive director of PLEN, believes that an important ingredient of PLEN's past success has been its focus on providing female political mentors as role models for its participating students. It is essential for women students to see female political leaders acting successfully as women in the political system.

To date, PLEN has emphasized the mentoring and cocurricular internship experiences; it is now considering how to assist member institutions in developing academic courses to increase understanding of the nature of leadership in a manner that can be coordinated with PLEN's historical role of arranging real-life experiences. Dr. Alexander views this as a process of faculty development. Perhaps the most important feature of PLEN as a leadership development program is that it confronts all of the problems that any leadership program must face, but it deals with them in a framework exploring the unique situation of women.

PLEN as a consortium also provides an example for other campus-based leadership activities. Cooperation is essential if all campuses are to share in community resources. Particularly in regard to national programs, but also in communities where there are a number of campuses, the opportunities for cocurricular internships and mentorships may become limited; a consortium for sharing may provide the best organizational solution to the practicum components of leadership programs. Such an approach will certainly reduce the organizational overhead of administering internships and mentorships.

The Lessons

This Cook's tour of diverse leadership programs suggests a number of lessons that may be of use to all of us with an interest in improving understanding of leadership and creating campus-based programs for students. I shall list the lessons I extract but with the

qualification that the evidence for these lessons comes from a sample based on idiosyncratic opportunities to meet the directors and hearing that the programs were worthwhile from colleagues across the country. The best that I can claim for my evidence is that it is suggestive; it certainly is not conclusive. Within this limitation, then, these are the lessons I take from my observations.

■ Leadership Programs Require a Leader

All of these programs were initiated and/or energized by a person who had the creativity to imagine the program. Some took existing programs and put new energy into them. Others constructed the programs from whole cloth. The essential role of one individual with organizational imagination to create a program is necessary, though not sufficient. Tampa has its Nelson, The Mount its Mabey, West Point its Prince, PLEN its Alexander; all are contingent on these personalities and their imagination.

I might also add that two national leaders have sparked programs elsewhere: Frank Pace, president of the National Executive Service Corps, has traveled around the country as what John Gardner has called "the Johnny Appleseed of leadership" planting enthusiasm and commitment wherever he has gone; and John Gardner himself has, through his publications and appearances, made the study of leadership challenging and respectable. So leadership at all levels is central to the study of leadership.

■ Academic Programs Require Substantial Faculty Involvement

Many leadership programs in the United States have emerged from the student development side of the campus. These cocurricular programs have been quite successful in generating student enthusiasm and motivating students to think seriously about leadership. The leadership programs that have developed substantial academic programs, however, are those with one or more faculty members playing key roles. It is important to note that the two examples of cocurricular programs — Tampa and Mount St. Mary's — are now generating faculty interest and participation in the study of leadership. Faculty members are developing academic courses to complement the cocurricular or modest credit courses, often in cooperation with the experienced student development professionals.

■ **Student Motivation Is Crucial to the Success of Academic Programs on Leadership**

West Point, Wooster, and Duke all have key components that give students experiential learning to complement the intellectual rigor of the academic courses and are integral to their courses. All of the academic exercises connect back to personal experiences of students. The students themselves use their mentorships, acquaintanceships, or personal leader and follower experiences to parse the theoretical analyses of the academic courses. This nexus between the intellectual and the experiential is central to the success of these leadership programs.

■ **Teaching About Leadership Is Not Making the Contribution It Might to the Broader Understanding of the Nature of Leadership**

26 Many of the academic courses about leadership are generating useful critiques of leadership literatures in papers and discussions in the classroom, but they are not reaching the larger audience of the scholars of leadership. With the exception of Professor Greenstein's course at Princeton, the insights of the leadership courses are not informing the work of active scholars of leadership. Teaching about leadership could become a medium for further research, if its written results were shared more widely with the network of leadership scholars.

■ **Leadership Courses and Programs Cost Money to Maintain But Require Only Imagination to Begin**

The combination of academic and cocurricular elements in the best leadership courses and programs is not inexpensive. Most leadership programs are initiated on the cheap; Duke is the obvious exception, with Wooster and Princeton tagging along. They start and are maintained by faculty and staff subsidies. The time commitments for successful leadership programs far exceed the average course or program, because of the high caliber and demanding students. All programs should have angels in the spirit of Duke, but in this least best of all possible worlds, they must have support of the university both materially and in spirit. In the beginning, the most important ingredient is organizational imagination from the leader of the leadership program.

■ **Coping with Multidisciplinarity Requires Cooperative Faculty Colleagues But Also an Endperson in the Leadership Minstrel**

Teaching about leadership necessarily requires the professor to draw on social psychology, political science, history, philosophy, anthropology, and probably five or six other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. Since there are very few polymaths for all seasons, professors teaching about leadership will undoubtedly begin and end from their home disciplines but will have to read about and draw upon the others. This requires cooperative colleagues. A comprehensive, introductory course about leadership will undoubtedly require a number of visiting firefighters from the disciplines as well as from the world of experience. Both Wooster and Duke exemplify the importance of this approach.

■ **One Course Can Begin the Understanding of Leadership But Does Not a Program Make**

West Point is the example *par excellence* of the value of a comprehensive program of leadership education carefully integrated into the larger campus educational plan if the study of leadership is to contribute to both an understanding of leadership and the development of leaders. The course on leadership that all cadets take as well as the elective and more specialized leadership courses are designed to connect with the larger culture of leadership expectations and comprehensive cocurricular activities. Duke, too, has connected its introductory course with life at Duke and in the larger community and is planning a number of additional courses and a series of cocurricular activities designed to maintain involvement, as are Mount St. Mary's. Institutions that wish to make explicit leadership development *and* the understanding of the nature of leadership central parts of their whole academic curriculum and community life must think out a sequential program with both curricular and cocurricular activities designed to build on one another over the four years of undergraduate education and also to continue into alumnae(i) experiences.

Most of these lessons are obvious, but it is often helpful to have the obvious codified in a manner that allows all of us to consider our programs in relation to a list. Of course this list is only suggestive and not exhaustive. It will be quite helpful for all of us if we can together enlarge and refine the list so that we can share our conclusions about the lessons to be learned from the examples of various leadership programs.

So You Want to Start a Leadership Program?

Although there are more than six hundred campuses which claim some form of leadership development program, my peripatetic review of the major types of programs suggests that most campuses are not yet involved in leadership education on the scale outlined in this essay. Therefore, I think it would be useful to posit the steps one might take to create a comprehensive leadership program.

Steps to a Leadership Program

1. Find a leader to lead and preferably two: one from the faculty and one from student affairs.

2. Ascertain student interest through informal, not necessarily systematic, means.

3. Initiate a cocurricular mentoring program that will allow students to meet people they would view as leaders in an informal and regular setting.

4. Design an introductory course modelled on the liberal arts approach of Duke and Wooster.

5. Elicit formal approval of a comprehensive leadership education program from the appropriate faculty committee(s).

6. Get the campus president's formal blessing and commitment to raise endowment funds for the program.

7. Find a rich alumnus with a commitment to leadership and invite him/her to follow Mitch Hart's example.

8. Require all students in the introductory leadership course to engage in some service activity and then write an extensive critique of it.

9. Ask all participating students to engage in research about a leader and or a theory of leadership.

10. Invite faculty in a range of departments to begin to offer courses from their disciplinary perspectives about leadership.

11. After two years, convene an evaluation team composed of other faculty, students who have participated, and leaders and scholars and teachers of leadership from off campus to evaluate your program.

12. After three years, give the founding faculty and staff leaders a full year's sabbatical to write about leadership and to recover from the 24-hour work days of running a comprehensive leadership program.

These suggestions do not add up to a guaranteed recipe for success, but they do provide an outline for beginning.

Resources

1. Leadership Project of the Council for Liberal Learning of the Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, NW, Washington, D.C.

2. Center for Creative Leadership, 5000 Laurinda Drive, Greensboro, North Carolina 27402.

3. National Executive Service Corps, 622 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017.

Conclusion

At the beginning, I suggested that the emergence of campus-based leadership programs was part of a larger phenomenon that could be characterized as a social movement. Most such movements do not begin with ideologies but instead reflect fundamental social trends. Our challenge as people interested in understanding leadership is to inform this emergent movement so that it can benefit from the results of reason as well as enthusiasm.

It is highly likely that within the next year or two almost every campus in the country will have some sort of leadership program — curricular, cocurricular, or both. Our challenge is to increase the probability that the quantity will have some quality. The programs outlined in this brief essay suggest both the problems and the opportunities. Those of us engaged in the Leadership Project look forward to working with you to guarantee that the problems will be solved and that the opportunities will be welcomed.

Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr.

List of Program Contacts

I. COCURRICULAR OR HYBRID

A. *University of Tampa*

Dr. Suzanne Nelson
Associate Provost
University of Tampa
Tampa, Florida
Phone: 813 - 253 - 3333 ext. 271

B. *Mount St. Mary's College*

Dr. Cheryl Mabey
Director, Women's Leadership Program
Mount St. Mary's College
12001 Chalon Road
Los Angeles, CA 90049
Phone: 213 - 476 - 2237 Ext. 3260

C. *Howard University*

Mr. Vincent Jones
Dean for Student Life
Howard University
Washington, D.C. 20059-0001
Phone: 202 - 636 - 6040

D. *University of Minnesota*

Dr. Thomas C. Shandley, Director
Leadership Programs & Services
University of Minnesota
Center for University Co-Curriculum
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: 612 - 373 - 3955

II. BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

West Point

Colonel Howard Prince
Department of Behavioral and Leadership Studies
United States Military Academy
West Point, New York 10996
Phone: 914 - 938 - 3206

III. LIBERAL ARTS PROGRAMS

A. *College of Wooster*

Professor James A. Hodges
Department of History
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691
Phone: 216 - 263 - 2000

B. *Duke University*

Mr. Bruce Payne, Director
Mr. John Ott, Associate Director
The Leadership Program
Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs
P.O. Box 4875
Duke Station
Durham, NC 27706
Phone: 919 - 684 - 4481

C. *Colorado College*

Professor Thomas Cronin
Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903
Phone: 303 - 473 - 2233

D. *Princeton University*

Professor Fred I. Greenstein
Department of Politics
Princeton University
Princeton, N.J. 08544
Phone: 609 - 452 - 4760

IV. A CONSORTIUM

Public Leadership Education Network
Dr. Marianne Alexander
PLEN
Goucher College
Towson, MD 21204
Phone: 301 - 337 - 6291

For further information on other programs contact:

Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr.
Executive Director,
Council for Liberal Learning
of the Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20009
Phone: 202 - 387 -3760